REMARKS

The above Amendment and these Remarks are in response to the Office Action mailed April 1, 2009. Claims 1-30 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-30. The present response amends 1, 2, 7, 9, 15, 19, 21, 22 and 26, cancel claims 9-14, and add claims 31-33, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-8, 15-30, and 31-33. Reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested.

I.   Claim Objections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 1, 9, 15, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims have been amended to comply with the statutory requirement under 35 U.S.C. 112.

II.   Claim Objections – 35 USC § 102 & 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 21 and 23-25, 28 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kemper, *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,804,682.

Claims 3, 8-12, 14-18, 20, 22 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper, *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,804,682 in view of Chan *et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0028364).

Claims 7 and 26 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper, *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,804,682 in view of Timbol (US 6,237,135).

Claims 13 and 19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kemper, *et al.* U.S. Patent No. 6,804,682 and Chan et al. (US 2003/0028364) in view of Timbol (US 6,237,135).

10

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to state as following.

1.   (Currently Amended) An interactive tool for manipulating a plurality of deployment descriptors, comprising:

a plurality of applications deployed on a web server, wherein each one of the plurality of applications is associated with one of the plurality of deployment descriptors that describes deployment and configuration information of the application on the web server; and

a builder component capable of

creating a master tree data structure based on the present state of all deployment descriptor files, wherein the master tree data structure represents a state of the logical hierarchy of resources associated with the plurality of applications at a given time;

creating a separate tree data structure that represents deployment descriptor information based on the current state of source files in an application's project directory, wherein the separate tree data structure represents a state of the logical hierarchy of resources associated with the application, wherein the application is one of the plurality of applications deployed on the web server;

comparing the master tree data structure with the separate tree data structure; and

refreshing the master tree data structure based on the separate tree data structure, if the master tree data structure is different from the separate tree data structure.

Kemper provides a method of managing resources for a single software application (Abstract; Figure 4; Column 9, Lines 48-50). In Column 14, Lines 50-58 and Column 23 Lines

11

54-63, Kemper discloses matching a node in a parse tree based on text name and type information of a given symbol.

In addition, Chan teaches development assistance for a program comprising code in more than one language (Abstract). Timbol teaches a Java bean is bundled in a Java archive (JAR) file (Column 10, Lines 24-26).

Applicant respectfully submits Kemper and other cited prior arts do not teach or render obvious that a builder component can compare a master tree data structure with a separate tree data structure. Here, as embodied in Claim 1, the master tree data structure represents a state of the logical hierarchy of resources associated with a plurality of applications at a given time based on the present state of all deployment descriptor files, and the separate tree data structure represents a state of the logical hierarchy of resources associated with one application based on the current state of source files in the application's project directory.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Kemper and other cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 21

Claims 9, 15 and 21, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8, 16-20 and 22-29

Claims 2-8, 16-20 and 22-29 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claim 31

Claim 31 depends on Claim 1. Furthermore Claim 31 includes the feature that *"the builder component is further capable of keeping a module in the master tree data structure to allow applications other than a current application to use the module, even after the module is removed from the current application."*

Applicant respectfully submits Kemper and other cited prior arts do not teach or render obvious this feature.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 31, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Kemper and other cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 32

Claim 32 is not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that this claim is allowable as depending from allowable independent claim 1, and further in view of the comments provided above.

Claim 33

Claim 33 depends on Claim 1. Furthermore Claim 33 includes the feature that *"the builder component is further capable of generating a new deployment descriptor for the application from the refreshed master tree data structure."*

Applicant respectfully submits Kemper and other cited prior arts do not teach or render obvious this feature.

13

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 33, as added, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of Kemper and other cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

II.   Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:_July 1, 2009   By:___/Kuiran (Ted) Liu/_____
                                              Kuiran (Ted) Liu
                                              Reg. No. 60,039

Customer No. 80548
FLEISLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, Fourteenth Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800

14